

Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1440 www.uspio.gov

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2004

CONFIRMATION NO. ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE YAO-4337US 2586 01/31/2001 Hideki Kuwajima 09/774,347 EXAMINER 05/03/2004 7590 LETSCHER, GEORGE J Mr. Andrew L. Ney Ratner & Prestia PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT Onc Westlakes, Berwyn, Suite 301 P.O. Box 980 2653

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		·
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/774,347	KUWAJIMA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	George J. Letscher	2653
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 31 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) da - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuto - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty ry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT by statute, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed o	on 24 February 2004.	
	☐ This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for		rs, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice u	•	·
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 29-43 is/are pending in the day of the above claim(s) is/are versions. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 29-43 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction.	vithdrawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Example 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 31 January 2001 Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by	is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ obj n to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance correction is required if the drawing(s	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for the a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. Certified copies of the priority documents.	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in App ne priority documents have been re Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sur	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date 15. 		Mail Date rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 2653

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 8/28/03 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. Specifically, Chinese Office Action dated 6/27/03 has no relevance provided.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 1, 29-34 and 37-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by PCT/US97/07233.

Art Unit: 2653

The aforementioned claims recite the following features, inter alia, disclosed in PCT/US97/07233: a head support mechanism including: a slider (24) having a magnetic head (25); a slider holding plate (arm which holds dimple (48)) for holding the slider; a pair of substrates (perpendicular portions 68A, 68B) each having an attached piezoelectric element (66A, 66B); elastic hinges (arms extending from the base of 22) bending depending on movement of the slider and dimple for connecting the slider plate and substrates; a dimple (48) for supporting the slider plate such that the slider plate is rotatable in the pitch, yaw and roll directions; wherein the slider is rotated around the dimple in the yaw direction by contraction and/or expansion of at least one of the piezoelectric elements. The substrates are stacked on each respective piezoelectric element, with at least one substrate bent by a bimorph effect and expansion at one of the piezoelectric elements. The dimple (48) is at an end of the of a load beam. The load beam has a pair of regulation portions (18) regulating rotation of the slider plate. The substrate roots are integral.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

⁽a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary

Art Unit: 2653

skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 5. Claims 35 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PCT/US97/07233.

The description of PCT/US97/07233 is in paragraph 2, supra.

Regarding claims 35 and 42, PCT/US97/07233 does not expressly show the substrates and piezoelectric elements are coated with resin.

Official notice is taken of the fact that resin coatings on piezoelectric elements and their substrates was notoriously old and well known at the time the invention was made.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the disk drive suspension of PCT/US97/07233 with the substrates and piezoelectric elements coated with resin. The rationale is as follows: one of ordinary skill in the art would have

Application/Control Number: 09/774,347

Art Unit: 2653

been motivated to have provided the disk drive suspension of PCT/US97/07233 with the substrates and piezoelectric elements coated with resin since one of ordinary skill in the art would have wanted to have protected the elements from stray electromagnetic signals that would have damaged the elements or the head signals.

6. Claims 36 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PCT/US97/07233 in view of Crane et al (US 6,362,939).

The description of PCT/US97/07233 is in paragraph 2, supra.

Regarding claims 36 and 43, PCT/US97/07233 does not expressly show the substrate portions and elastic hinge portions having a conductor pattern transferring a signal to the head.

Crane et al disclose a microactuator suspension having a conductor pattern from the substrate portions and elastic hinge portions having a conductor pattern transferring a signal to the head; see Figures 2-3 and 26-27 of Crane et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have furnished the disk drive suspension having substrate portions and elastic hinge portions of PCT/US97/07233 with the substrate portions and elastic hinge portions having a conductor pattern transferring a signal to the head as taught by Crane et al. The rationale is as follows: one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have

Art Unit: 2653

furnished the disk drive suspension having substrate portions and elastic hinge portions of PCT/US97/07233 with the substrate portions and elastic hinge portions having a conductor pattern transferring a signal to the head as taught by Crane et al so that the signals between the head and the piezoelectric materials would have been coordinated for optimum performance of the suspension.

Response to Amendment

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 29-43 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment to claims 1, 29, 34, 37-38 and 40 necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH

Application/Control Number: 09/774,347

Art Unit: 2653

shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on

the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In

no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX

MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications

from the examiner should be directed to George Letscher whose telephone

number is (703) 305-7912.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this

application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone

number is (703) 305-4750.

George Letscher April 30, 2004

> George Letscher Primary Examiner

Page 7

AU 2653